

EXPRESSION OF DEONTIC MODALITY IN RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH SUPERSTITIONS OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL ORIENTATION

Nailya N. Fattakhova, Mariya A. Kulkova, Svetlana V. Tuganova

Kazan Federal University, 18, Kremlyovskaya Str., 420008, Kazan,
Institute of Economics, Management and Law, 42, Moscow Str., 420111, Kazan (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)

DOI: 10.7813/jil.2015/6-2/89

Received: 01 Mar, 2015

Accepted: 06 May, 2015

ABSTRACT

In the initiated study on the language material selected from the reports of ethnographic expeditions, the dictionaries of ethnosciences and superstitious beliefs of XIX – early XX centuries, the ways of expression of deontic modality in the Russian and English superstitious beliefs about man have been investigated. Topicality of the present research is explained by the fact that the norms of morality, ethical norms of behaviour expressed in various prohibitions and restrictions played the role of rigid limiting standards of behaviour in society from time immemorial. Their emergence refers to the period of existing of archaic man and was of great importance as guarantee of survival of ancient man under conditions of unfavourable natural phenomena, meetings with representatives of other ethnic communities, etc. The work demonstrates that the deontic modality reflects in both languages, and the language means of its expression are graduated with different degree of categoricity.

Key words: deontic modality, popular superstitions, norms of human behavior

1. INTRODUCTION

Linguoculturological studies oriented to studying the culture, mentality of nation gain special currency with assertion in science of anthropocentric paradigm oriented to realizing the problem of representation of «man in language» and «language in man». Forming anthropocentric paradigm has led to the development of linguistic problematics towards man and his place in culture, for language personality in all her manifoldness is in the limelight of culture.

«There is no need to argue», R. I. Rozina writes, that «the concept «man» – is a key concept of any culture. Without analysis of its content and adequate description of culture is impossible: the place of any realities in the system of cultural values – irrespective of the fact whether this realities belongs to the man-made world or the world not made by hand, – may be defined only through the role that is played by man towards this realities» [1].

So, for linguoculturological research we are selecting superstitious beliefs of anthropological orientation as a fragment of folk picture of the world, being guided by the thought of V.A. Maslova about the fact that «image of a man has been forever depicted in folkloric texts, proverbs, phraseological units, therefore studying this material is of great interest to linguoculturology» [2].

From our viewpoint, popular superstitions are referred to proverbs, or paremiological constructions, which represent «autonomous set expressions of indefinitely-reference type, that are the product of centuries-old national reflection and oriented to modeling human behavior» [3], [4].

In J. Layonz's judgement, «people are social beings with socially predefined and socially authorized roles» [5].

Any culture is characterized by strict moral and ethic prohibitions regulating both socially-important behaviour of people and their personal lives and interpersonal relations. For this purpose an individual culture develops the ways of management of morals – «restriction rules» (the term of K. Lévi-Strauss), to which social view, customs and individual consciousness refer. Society enforces inevitable severe punishments, social and individual encouragements or blames.

The norms of morals, ethic norms of behaviour expressed in different prohibitions and restrictions of everyday and social behaviour have been a kind of strict limiting frameworks of co-existence in society since olden times. Their origin goes back to the period of archaic man as the most important element of guarantees of survival of prehistoric man in the face of mysterious natural phenomena, meetings with the representatives of «alien» ethnoses and such terrible and inexplicable phenomenon/punishment as anger of pagan gods.

In the encyclopedia of the American folklore it is noted that «Prohibitions establish and fix those fundamental values that bind a society together» [6].

Assuming that if from time immemorial archaic man faced with the natural forces and anger of gods then conquering his fear he had by any possibility to survive under such conditions creating and keeping in line with rules and prohibitions that regulated his relatively «harmoneous» existence and interaction in society and with nature.

Thus one of the major objectives of this work is to discover certain features of using «modal markers» in the language of superstitious weather sayings of anthropological orientation. The task of the research – is to make a linguistic analysis of the means of deontic modality of the compared languages.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The term deontic comes from the Greek word connected with laying obligations on. It is borrowed from modal logic as well as the term epistemic [7]. J. Layonz notes that «deontic modality is based on necessity» [8].

The works of many philosophers and philologists are devoted to the investigation in the field of deontic logic and deontic modality, in our work we have considered the studies of such scholars as G. H. von Wright (1967) [9], Leech, G.N. (2004) [10], de Haan (2002) [11], Quirk, R. (1985) [12], Biber, D. (1999) [13], Palmer, F.R. (1988) [14], Lew, R. (1997) [15] and many others.

"Defining deontic modals", Palmer F.R. says that "they give or refuse permission, lay an obligation, or make a promise, and the modals are used for rules and obligations" [16].

Deontic modality, oriented to actions, represents orders, permissions and prohibitions [17], [18]; is connected with morality, duty, with demands for behaviour of participants of a situation, with rules set by the corresponding system, with standard and non-standard behaviour [19], is of distinctly didactic character. In theoretical grammar of the English language the deontic function of modality is oriented to "social interaction" [20].

Deontic modality, deontics: (from Gk *deon* 'duty') 'involves the issuing of directives and is associated with notions of such as permission or obligation' [21].

D. Biber singles out the subgroup of verbs of such as «obligation/necessity» обязательства / необходимости: *must, should, (had) better, have (got) to, need to, ought to, be supposed to* [22]. The scholar also says about "two typical structural correlates of deontic modals: (i) the subject is human, (ii) the main verb is dynamic (describing an activity that can be controlled)". [23].

In collective monograph by R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik it is indicated that "Just as *must* and *should*, for example, have both 'necessity' and 'obligation' meanings, so do the semi-auxiliaries be bound to and be supposed to" [24].

To one of the means of expression of deontic modality one refers «a special circle of predicative expressions, denoting modal estimate, which form combinations with the infinitive of demonstrative words and are used to denote state» [25]: 1) the words, expressing modal meaning of possibility, necessity, need: one can, one should, one must, one should, need, it is impossible and so on; 2) the words referring to the category of state, expressing moral-ethic qualification of action, for example, sin.

Thus these «combinations of words from the category of state with the form of infinitive express modal meanings, similar to those found in purely verbal combinations. Many of syntagmata are variable and can be referred to the whole sentence and to its predicate and separate parts of the sentence» [26].

M.L. Vasilyev gives this group of modal-estimating predicates of need and necessity at great length: *надо/ нужно, должно, следует, надлежит, придется, должен* [27]:

надо / must: Зевнув, надо сразу перекрестить рот, чтобы заградить туда вход нечистому духу; To start the day "on the right foot", symbolically and factually, one must cover the right foot first and the left one last;

нужно, должно: Ртом из реки воду пить грешно, нужно черпать рукой; следует, надлежит / should: Детям по умершим родителям непременно следует плакать; If two people say the same words at the same moment, they should lock their little fingers together, right hand to right hand or left to left, and wish silently. The wish will come true provided that nothing more is said until the fingers are released;

придется / happen to: Кончик носа чешется - придется в рюмочку смотреть; When starting out on a journey or any important enterprise, it is a good sign if you happen to sneeze to the right, but a bad one if to the left, or in the general direction of a grave;

должен, должен быть / have to: Все зубы у заговорщика должны быть целы, иначе он заговаривать не сможет; If a money spider runs along your right arm you will receive money ... If it runs on your left arm, you will have to pay out, but swing it sunwise round your head three times and it won't be much.

The deontic necessity is observed in the latter group of the examples. F. de Haan notes "The modal *dolžen* is the prototypical modal to express strong deontic modality or obligation in Russian" [28].

F.R. Palmer observes that «there are many examples of using the verb *must*, when it seems that the addressee is not involved (involve the speaker) and therefore the meaning *must* is not strictly deontic, but rather neutral: *If you want to be rich, you must work hard*. Here the obligation *to work hard* does not emanate from the speaker, but is dependent on the condition that the addressee wants to be rich [29].

In the Russian language the opposite meaning of *нужно, следует, должно* is formed by means of paronymous antonyms with the particle *не*. For example: *не нужно, не следует, не должно: Не следует задувать горящую свечу ртом, а надлежит загасить ее пальцами; Кто прикасаясь к мертвому, тот не должен сеять: зерно замрет в его руках и не даст всходов.*

The equivalent of these constructions in the English language is the construction *must not*: A grave *must not* be dug except on the day of burial, for if a grave is left open overnight, there will be another death.

In human consciousness the physical death is not equal to spiritual death, and all saintly and unjust actions of physical man will have been reflected then (i.e. after death) in the other life of his spiritual constituent, i.e. spirit. For example: *Не нужно* ни на кого плевать, потому что за это на том свете плюнувший будет лизать горячую сковородку; If the procession should stop another death will soon follow, a mishap on the way probably indicating that the corpse is dissatisfied and regrets having to leave this world [30].

The researcher Celce-Murcia notes: «Usually, when you negate something, the main meaning of the sentence is expressed in the negative form. In the English language this rule is not observed:

1. In the affirmative form the modal verb *must* and its equivalent *have to* express obligation, rule» [31]: In order for a town crier to be a good one, he *must* be a twin (obligation); If you take the last biscuit on the plate, you will *have to* kiss the cook (obligation).

2. In the negative form the meaning of the verb *must* changes [32]: A bride *must not* see the groom on her wedding day until the wedding (no obligation); A person with long fingers *will not have to* scratch for a living (no obligation).

3. RESULTS

In the English language the deontic modality is expressed by means of the modal verbs *should / ought to / must / have to*. The verb *should* is used to express moral obligation or advice and in this case has the meaning 'должен', 'следует', 'следовало бы' [33].

Ought to expresses advisability, reasonability of actions correlating with moral obligations, duty. The verb *must* expresses obligation, order or obligatoriness of something: *должен, обязан* (inescapable obligation).

Leech G. N. writes that the verbs *must* and *have to* can express "practical necessity", where to reach some goal (expressed by an if-clause, to-infinitive) some kind of action is a necessary or required condition. [34]: If you want to kill potato bugs, you *have to* go out at the hour of twelve to three when the sun is the hottest.

The full form *must not* expresses prohibition of the representative from outer party, vested with moral and juridical power. In the contracted form this verb (mustn't) does not have the meaning of categorical prohibition on the part of ordinary man in accordance with his conceptions of this question: *нельзя, не должен, запрещается* [35].

In Van der Auwera's judgement, "Sometimes the negative modal does not involve any collocation. The negative modal is expressed with a negative lexeme, such as *mustn't* and *needn't* in English and Russian *nel'zja*, – there is no lexeme *l'zja*" [36].

Permission and prohibition in the Russian language are expressed by means of such basic predicates of permission / prohibition (permissives and prohibitives), as, for example, *можно* (in the meaning is allowed) and *нельзя* [37], which «can appeal simultaneously to general moral principles, utilitarian «considerations», and can be explicit in the text» [38]. For example: Если вернулся зачем-то с полпути – перед новым выходом посмотри на себя в зеркало и покажи себе язык. Можно заглянуть под коврик, половик – тоже помогает; Доливать воды из квартиры в горшок, наполненный какой-нибудь кипящей жидкостью – нельзя: от этого на губах явятся волдыри; If, on leaving your house, you see a black snail, seize it boldly by one of its horns and throw it over your left shoulder; you may then go on your way prosperously, but if you fling it over your right shoulder, you will draw down ill luck; If a tooth comes out during school-hours, it must not be burnt then and there, but must be taken home for the mother to put on the fire.

The highest frequency of using weather sayings in the Russian texts is demonstrated by the construction with an indicative form of the verb in third person plural and negation *не*: «На Вознесенье в поле *не работают*», «На Ильин день скота *не выгоняют* в поле», «На Казанскую добрые люди вдаль (в отъезд) *не ездят*», «В Рождественский сочельник *не кормят* кур, чтобы огородов не копали», «От Троицы до Успения хороводов *не водят*», etc. The stated constructions do not always include a well-reasoned part that is explained by lower level of categoricity of these statements not requiring their additional «lessening» under conditions of observance of the principle of politeness in speech communication.

The constructions «*запрещается + infinitive*» (*is forbidden + infinitive*), «*не должно + infinitive*» (*one ought not + infinitive*) serve as less frequent means of explication of illocutionary force of prohibition in the Russian texts of weather sayings: «На Благовещенье *запрещается подметать* в доме и особенно *выбрасывать* мусор на огород или в поле: от этого разводятся сорняки», «В сырую погоду и в дождь *не должно сеять* ржи; как обмочило оглобли, так и поезжай домой».

In the paremiological texts the use of the constructions, in which «crucial component» of the semantic structure of prohibitive expression is explicated by lexemes «*грех*», «*грешно*» expressing «mental and ethical qualification of the action», is also possible [39]: *На Симона Зилота земля именинница: грех пахать; В эту ночь (ночь под Вознесенье) ловить соловьев большой грех – кто поймает, тому во весь год ни в чем спорины (удачи) не будет; Под Рождество ткать грешно; несчастье уходит в праздник; В шапке грех в избе сидеть; В огонь грешно плевать; It is sinful for any mother to go out before being churchd.*

In the system of the Russian sayings the most categorical illocutionary expressions are prohibitive constructions containing imperative forms of the verb that consists of «*не + Imperative 2nd person singular*»: *На Федоры не мети из избы сора, Не сей хлеб, когда днем виден месяц; Не оглядывайся через левое плечо – неровен час, увидишь черта, который там таится, следит за человеком и подталкивает его на неблагие дела; Вымыл руки – вытри, но не стряхивай воду, не плоди чертей.*

The greatest degree of categoricity in the Russian sayings is expressed by the word combinations «*не / нельзя + Infinitive form of the verb*»: *В светлый праздник огня в домах не разводиться – будет головня в пшенице, или: не гасить с вечера, Когда рожь цветет, нельзя холстов белить.*

In the English language one of the means of expressing the imperative may be: 1) the contracted form of auxiliary *Do* and negative particle *not* *Don't* and the infinitive of the main verb to convey prohibition with the shade of advice, for example: *Don't kiss your elbow or you'll turn into a person of the opposite sex*; 2) full form *Do not* and infinitive of the main form mainly to convey prohibition (in official announcements) [40]; 3) adverb of frequency *never* and the basic form of the main verb in initial part of the sentence convey advice [41], например: *Never put your feet on a table, or there will be quarrels.*

4. CONCLUSION

In the course of the conducted analysis it has been established that the following language means refer to the ways of verbal expression of deontic modality:

1) the words, expressing modal meaning of possibility, obligation, necessity: *можно, должно, надобно, надо, нужно, нельзя, запрещается, не должно* in the Russian language and the constructions *should / ought to / must / have to / must not / should not / will not, etc.* in the English language;

2) the words denoting the categories of state, expressing mental and ethic qualification of action, for example: *грех, грешно* in the Russian language and *sinful* in the English language.

Thus superstitious beliefs of anthropological orientation are the main object of study of culture experts, linguists, sociologists as they contain the important information of culturological and ethic aspects which is expressed in the language by morphological means of modality. Reflecting social interaction of a man in society, the markers of deontic modality convey the meaning of prohibition, recommendation.

THE CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors confirm that the present data do not contain the conflict of in interests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

1. Rozina, R.I., 2003. Man and Peronality in Language // Logical Analysis of Language: Selected works. 1988-1995. M.: Indrik, 2003, P. 369.
2. Maslova, V.A., 2004. Linguistic Study of Culture. Moscow: Academy, P. 143.

3. Fattakhova, N., & Kulkova, M., 2014. The Formation of Paremiology in Russia and Germany // *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 31 (5), DOI: 10.5829/idosi.wasj.2014.31.05.14334, p. 935.
4. Kulkova, M.A., & Shaimardanova, M.R., 2014. Evaluative Conceptualization in Paremiology Language (on examples of Russian and English languages). *Life Sci J*, 11(7), p. 485.
5. Layonz, J., 2003. Linguistic Semantics. Introduction. Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture, P. 59.
6. Oring, E., 1996. Functionalism. American Folklore: encyclopedia / ed. by Jan Brunwandt. New York; London, Vol. 1551, p. 654.
7. Layonz, J., 2003. Linguistic Semantics. Introduction. Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture, P. 271.
8. Layonz, J., 2003. Linguistic Semantics. Introduction. Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture, P. 350.
9. Wright, von G.H., 1967. Deontic logics. American Philosophical Quarterly 4 (2), pp. 136-143.
10. Leech, G.N., 2004. Meaning and the English verb. 3-rd ed. London: Longman, 132 pp.
11. De Haan, F., 2002. Strong modality and negation in Russian // *Studies in Corpus Linguistics*, pp. 91-110.
12. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech G. & J. Svartvik, 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman, pp. 1779.
13. Biber, D. et al, 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. London: Longman, pp. 1203.
14. Palmer, F.R., 1988. The English Verb. London: Longman, 2-nd ed., pp. 268.
15. Lew, R., 1997. Towards a Taxonomy of Linguistic Jokes // *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 31, pp. 132-152.
16. Palmer, F.R., 2004. Modality and the English Modals. 2-nd ed. London: Routledge, pp. 256.
17. Babushkin, A.P., 2001. «Possible Worlds» in the Semantic Space of Language. Voronezh: Voronezh State University, P. 12.
18. Smirnova, Ye.D., 1990. Fundamentals of Logic Semantics. Moscow, Higher school, P. 110.
19. Human Factor in Language: Communication, Modality, Deixis, 1992. Moscow: Science, P. 141.
20. Celce-Murcia, M., Larsen-Freeman, D., 1999. The Grammar Book. An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers, p. 141.
21. Lew, R., 1997. Towards a Taxonomy of Linguistic Jokes // *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 31, p. 146.
22. Biber, D. et al, 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. London: Longman, p. 485.
23. Biber, D. et al, 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. London: Longman, p. 485.
24. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech G. & J. Svartvik, 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman, p. 237.
25. Vinogradov, V. V., 1950. About Category of Modality and Modal words in the Russian Language // *The Works of Institute of the Russian Language of AS of the USSR. Moscow-Leningrad*, V. 2, P. 53.
26. Vinogradov, V. V., 1950. About Category of Modality and Modal words in the Russian Language // *The Works of Institute of the Russian Language of AS of the USSR. Moscow-Leningrad*, V. 2, P. 54.
27. Vasilyev, M.I., 2000. System Semantic Dictionary of the Russian Language. Ufa: Eastern University, Issue 1, P. 74.
28. De Haan, F., 2002. Strong Modality and Negation in Russian // *Studies in Corpus Linguistics*, p. 96.
29. Palmer, F.R., 2004. Modality and the English Modals. 2-nd ed. London: Routledge, p. 126.
30. Tuganova, S.V., 2011. Existential Notion of Death in Superstitious Consciousness (on material of the Russian and English omens of anthropological orientation) // *Herald of Tatar State Humanitarian Pedagogical University. Kazan*, Issue. 23, P. 196.
31. Celce-Murcia, M., Larsen-Freeman, D., 1999. The Grammar Book. An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers, p. 194.
32. Celce-Murcia, M., Larsen-Freeman, D., 1999. The Grammar Book. An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers, p. 195.
33. Palmer, F.R., 2004. Modality and the English modals. 2-nd ed. London: Routledge, p. 132.
34. Leech, G.N., 2004. Meaning and the English verb. London: Longman, p. 80.
35. Alexander, L.G., 1988. Longman English Grammar. London: Longman Group UK Limited, p. 232.
36. Van der Auwera, J., 2001. On the Typology of Negative Modals // *Perspectives on negation and polarity items*. Vol. 23, p. 24.
37. Vasilyev, M. L., 2003. Semantic Dictionary of the Russian Languages. Ufa: RIO BashSU, 2003, Issue. 5, P. 87.
38. Shatunovsky, I. B., 2000. Speech Acts of Prohibition and Permission in the Russian Language // *Logical Analysis of Language: Languages of Ethics*. Moscow: Languages of the Russian Culture, P. 323.
39. Vinogradov, V. V., 1975. Study on the Russian Grammar. The Selected Works. Moscow: Science, P. 66.
40. Celce-Murcia, M., Larsen-Freeman, D., 1999. The Grammar Book. An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers, p. 234.
41. Alexander, L.G., 1988. Longman English Grammar. London: Longman Group UK Limited, p. 185.